



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,258	07/24/2001	Robert F. Kovar	48995/70184	4129

21874 7590 03/10/2005

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. BOX 55874
BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

HARLAN, ROBERT D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1713

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/912,258

Applicant(s)

KOVAR ET AL.

Examiner

Robert D. Harlan

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/07/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for

Art Unit: 1713

establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovar et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,927,269 (hereinafter "Kovar I"), Kovar et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,150,429 (hereinafter "Kovar II") or Rubin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,300,457 (hereinafter "Rubin"). Kovar I teaches oligomers for forming coating compositions based on vinyl dioxolane end-capped polyester oligomers. See Kovar I, Abstract; col. 3, line 45 through col. 6, line 39. Kovar II teaches oligomers for forming coating compositions based on vinyl dioxolane end-capped polyester oligomers. See Kovar II, Abstract; col. 3, line 30 through col. 6, line 59. Rubin teaches oligomers for forming coating compositions based on vinyl dioxolane end-capped polyester oligomers. See Rubin, Abstract; col. 4, line 51 through col. 9, line 31.

Art Unit: 1713

5. The Applicants argue Kovar I, Kovar II and Rubin would not inherently have enzyme degradable, vinyl dioxalane end-capped oligomer because the vinyl dioxalane oligomer would not necessarily be enzyme degradable. The Applicants have not provide any evidence to support their contention that vinyl dioxalane end-capped oligomer would not necessarily be enzyme degradable in the prior art references, but the vinyl dioxalane end-capped oligomer are enzyme degradable in the present invention.

6. The basic requirements of prima facie case of obvious are: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; (3) the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP 2143. The Applicants further assert there is no suggestion or motivation to incorporate a comonomer in Applicant's claimed ranges into the polypropylene fibers to arrive at the material produced by Applicants' invention.

"There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the

Art Unit: 1713

teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art." See In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Although Kovar I, Kovar II or Rubin does not disclose in the working examples specific polyesters, based on the specification as a whole a polymer chemist of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify Kovar I, Kovar II or Rubin by using polyesters. Such modification would be obvious because one would have a reasonable expectation of success that polyesters as taught by Kovar I, Kovar II or Rubin would be similarly useful and applicable to specific polyesters of the present invention. Therefore, claims 1-21 are deemed as being unpatentable over Kovar I, Kovar II or Rubin.

Conclusion


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert D. Harlan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1102. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10 AM - 8 PM.

8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Wu can be

Art Unit: 1713

reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-1102 for regular communications and (571) 273-1102 for After Final communications.

9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1495.



Robert D. Harlan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1713

rdh
March 1, 2005